

## REMARKS

Applicants have carefully studied the outstanding Office Action. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claims **12 – 15, 18** and **27 - 30** are presented for examination.

In Paragraphs 1 - 7 of the Office Action, claims **12 – 15, 18** and **27 – 30** have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dykes et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,872,915 (“Dykes”) in view of Scherpbier, U.S. Patent No. 6,263,365 (“Scherpbier”), and further in view of Balassanian, U.S. Patent No. 6,976,248 (“Balassanian”).

In Paragraph 8 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner correctly notes that Applicants' remarks submitted on February 13, 2006 were inconsistent with the Office Action issued on September 26, 2005; and the Examiner has correctly addressed the remarks that applicant submitted on December 12, 2005, instead. Applicants confirm that the remarks submitted on February 13, 2006 were inconsistent and based upon an older office action, and appreciate the Examiner's corrective action.

The rejections of claims **12 – 15, 18** and **27 – 30** in paragraphs 1 - 7 of the Office Action will now be dealt with specifically.

As to independent method claim **12**, applicants respectfully submit that the element in claim **12** of:

*“transmitting a program applet with a password embedded therewithin from a server computer to a client computer, via a network, the password having a limited operational life, the program applet including executable code that runs on the client computer”*

is neither shown nor suggested in Dykes, Scherpbier or Balassanian, taken individually or in combination.

In their previous response, applicants have respectfully argued that, opposite to the above claim element, Dykes and Scherpbier describe sending password information from a client computer to a server computer. In paragraph 8 of the subject office action, the Office Action expresses agreement with applicants, and relies upon Balassanian to disclose the feature of sending password information from a server computer to a client computer.

Balassanian describes transmitting applets from an applet server computer (element **10** of **FIG. 1** of Balassanian) to a client computer (elements **12** and **14** of

**FIG. 1).** The applet server computer of Balassanian performs compilation and verification, thereby eliminating the need for the client computer to have the necessary local resources to verify or compile the transmitted applet (Balassanian / col. 2, lines 20 – 27).

However, in distinction from the claimed invention, Balassanian does not concern password control of applets. Applicants respectfully submit that Balassanian does not discuss use of passwords at all. The above element in claim **12** concerns transmitting a password embedded within an applet from a server computer to a client computer. As such, the above element of claim **12** is neither shown nor suggested in Dykes, Scherpbier or Balassanian, taken individually or in combination.

Because claims **13 – 15** and **18** depend from claim **12** and include additional features, applicants respectfully submit that claims **13 – 15** and **18** are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Dykes, Scherpbier, Balassanian or a combination thereof.

Accordingly claims **12 – 15** and **18** are respectfully submitted to be allowable.

For the same rationale as set forth hereinabove with respect to method claim **12**, applicants respectfully submit that the element in independent system claim **27** of:

*“embed said password within said program applet, and transmit said program applet with said password embedded therewithin to the client computer via a network”*

is neither shown nor suggested in Dykes, Scherpbier or Balassanian, taken individually or in combination.

Because claims **28 – 30** depend from claim **27** and include additional features, applicants respectfully submit that claims **28 – 30** are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Dykes, Scherpbier, Balassanian or a combination of Dykes, Scherpbier and Balassanian.

Accordingly claims **27 – 30** are respectfully submitted to be allowable.

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned counsel at (650) 838-4300 to arrange for such a conference.

No fees are believed to be due beyond those noted in the included transmittal letter, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment in fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2207, including any funds necessitated due to a check being drawn on an account with insufficient funds. To the extent necessary and not otherwise requested, Applicant requests an Extension of Time to respond to the Office Action, and requests that the fee for such an extension be charged to Deposit Account number 50-2207.

Respectfully submitted,  
Perkins Coie LLP

Date: August 1, 2006

/Glenn E. Von Tersch/  
Glenn E. Von Tersch  
Registration No. 41,364

**Correspondence Address:**

Customer No. 22918  
Perkins Coie LLP  
P.O. Box 2168  
Menlo Park, California 94026  
(650) 838-4300